

EXHIBIT J



NATIONAL COURT REPORTERS INC

SERVING LEGAL PROFESSIONALS COAST TO COAST AND INTERNATIONALLY

In The Matter Of

La Union Del Pueblo Entero, et al.,

Plaintiffs

v

State Of Texas, et al.,

Defendants

CASE

5:21-cv-844

Date

4-27-2022

Witness

Jonathan Sherman White

**Certified Copy
Transcript**

National Court Reporters Inc. • 888.800.9656 •

NationalCourtReporters.com

NCRNetwork@nationalcourtreporters.com

Serving Legal Professionals From Coast To Coast and Internationally

5:21-cv-844 (XR)
4/27/2022

Entero v Texas
 NATIONAL COURT REPORTERS INC 888.800.9656

Jonathan Sherman White 1

1

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
 SAN ANTONIO DIVISION

LA UNION DEL PUEBLO §
 ENTERO, ET AL., §
 Plaintiffs, § Civil Action No.
 § 5:21-cv-844 (XR)
 VS. § (Consolidated Cases)
 §
 STATE OF TEXAS, ET AL. §
 Defendants. §

ORAL DEPOSITION OF
 JONATHAN SHERMAN WHITE
 APRIL 27, 2022

ORAL DEPOSITION OF JONATHAN SHERMAN WHITE,
 produced as a witness at the instance of the Plaintiffs
 and Plaintiff-Intervenors, and duly sworn, was taken in
 the above-styled and numbered cause on the 27th day of
 April 2022, from 9:11 a.m. to 5:31 p.m., before Caroline
 Chapman, CSR in and for the State of Texas, reported by
 Computerized Stenotype Machine, Computer-Assisted
 Transcription, held at the William P. Clements Jr. State
 Office Building, 300 West 15th Street, Hearing Room
 1001E, Austin, Texas, pursuant to the Federal Rules of
 Civil Procedure.

Entero v Texas 5:21-cv-844 (XR)
4/27/2022

Entero v Texas
 National Court Reporters Inc. 888.800.9656

1 Jonathan Sherman White

Page: 1

5:21-cv-844 (XR)
4/27/2022

Entero v Texas
NATIONAL COURT REPORTERS INC 888.800.9656

Jonathan Sherman White 16

16

1 **A. I suppose that would be me.**

2 **Q. And what would be necessary for you to -- to**
3 **make that approval?**

4 **MR. HUDSON: Well, I'm going to object, to**
5 **the extent that that would call for investigative**
6 **privilege, attorney work-product or attorney-client**
7 **communications. To the extent that you can answer**
8 **generally without encroaching on any of those**
9 **privileges, you're free to do so, but otherwise I'm**
10 **going to instruct you not to answer.**

11 **A. I think primarily there would have to be a**
12 **determination that a criminal statute -- a criminal**
13 **statute was violated and that there is sufficient**
14 **evidence to proceed.**

15 **Q. And when you say there would be sufficient**
16 **evidence to proceed, is there a legal standard that**
17 **would be relevant in you determining whether to proceed**
18 **with a case?**

19 **A. Probable cause, in Texas.**

20 **Q. And how long have you been the Division Chief**
21 **of the Election Integrity Division?**

22 **A. I don't recall when exactly it was popped out**
23 **as a standalone division, but it was prior to that. I**
24 **would say that's been in the last year or so, or less**
25 **than that. Prior to that, it was a section of the**

5:21-cv-844 (XR)
4/27/2022

Entero v Texas
NATIONAL COURT REPORTERS INC 888.800.9656

Jonathan Sherman White 23

23

1 **A. I was involved to some degree with, primarily,**
2 **I believe some of the predecessor bills.**

3 Q. In what way were you involved with the drafting
4 of the predecessor bills of Senate Bill 1?

5 **A. In -- in being requested to provide guidance**
6 **regarding portions of those bills.**

7 Q. Which portions of the predecessor bills were
8 you asked to provide guidance on?

9 MR. HUDSON: Object to the extent that it
10 calls for attorney-client privilege, attorney
11 work-product, or legislative privileged information. To
12 the extent that you can respond without encroaching on
13 any of those privileges, you're free to do so,
14 otherwise, I'm going to instruct you not to answer.

15 **A. I don't know that I can answer that.**

16 Q. Have you been asked -- or were you -- excuse
17 me, were you asked to testify during any hearings on
18 Senate Bill 1 or any of its predecessor bills?

19 **A. I was called as a resource witness on some of**
20 **those hearings on the predecessor bills, and on SB 1, I**
21 **believe, actually, as well.**

22 Q. How many times were you asked to provide
23 testimony on Senate Bill 1 or its predecessor bills?

24 **A. As an estimate, I would say I was probably**
25 **asked to provide testimony or appear as a resource**

5:21-cv-844 (XR)
4/27/2022

Entero v Texas
NATIONAL COURT REPORTERS INC 888.800.9656

Jonathan Sherman White 24

24

1 witness maybe 10 times. And I probably actually
2 testified maybe half of that.

3 Q. When you testified for -- excuse me --
4 withdrawn.

5 When you were called to testify, what were
6 you asked to testify about?

7 MR. HUDSON: I'm going to object to the
8 extent that that would encroach on attorney-client or
9 attorney work-product or legislative privilege. To the
10 extent that you can answer, you can do so. Otherwise,
11 I'll instruct you not to answer.

12 And just for clarification of the record,
13 is your question directed at what he was asked to
14 testify about in public, or are you asking if there was
15 a specific ask made by legislators? Because that would
16 help me instruct him so that he can actually answer your
17 question.

18 MS. PAIKOWSKY: Of course.

19 Q. (By Ms. Paikowsky) I think for the moment we
20 can limit it to what you were asked to testify in a
21 public forum.

22 A. Wow. I -- I don't think I could even begin to
23 cover all the questions that I was asked publicly. But
24 generally it pertained to criminal provisions within the
25 bills.

Entero v Texas 5:21-cv-844 (XR)
4/27/2022

Entero v Texas
National Court Reporters Inc. 888.800.9656

24 Jonathan Sherman White

Page: 24

5:21-cv-844 (XR)
4/27/2022

Entero v Texas
NATIONAL COURT REPORTERS INC 888.800.9656

Jonathan Sherman White 25

25

1 Q. Do you -- withdrawn. Which criminal provisions
2 within SB 1 or its predecessor bills were you asked to
3 provide testimony on?

4 MR. HUDSON: Same objections. To the
5 extent that it's in the public record, you can answer;
6 otherwise, I'm going to instruct you not to answer if
7 it's going to encroach on attorney-client, attorney
8 work-product or legislative privilege.

9 A. In the -- in the public committee hearings, I
10 don't recall specifically which criminal provisions
11 within the bills I was asked questions about, and a lot
12 of it really ran together.

13 Q. Do you recall if you were asked to testify on
14 provisions to the voter assistant's oath in Senate
15 Bill 1?

16 MR. HUDSON: Same objection.

17 A. I don't --

18 MR. HUDSON: Same objections. To the
19 extent that the question is inquiring about public
20 questions, you can answer; otherwise, I'm instructing
21 you not to answer unless you can avoid encroaching on
22 the attorney-client, attorney work-product or
23 legislative privileges.

24 A. I don't recall being asked about the oath
25 provisions in Senate Bill 1. I do recall being asked

5:21-cv-844 (XR)
4/27/2022

Entero v Texas
NATIONAL COURT REPORTERS INC 888.800.9656

Jonathan Sherman White 27

27

1 that assistance being provide to the voter.

2 Q. How does your office interpret the mandates of
3 this oath?

4 MR. HUDSON: Object to the extent that it
5 calls for attorney-client communications or attorney
6 work-product or investigative privilege. To the extent
7 that you can answer without encroaching on any of those
8 privileges, you're free to do so; otherwise, I instruct
9 you not to answer.

10 A. I can testify as to how I would interpret the
11 oath. But could you repeat the last part of your
12 question, though?

13 Q. How does your office interpret the mandates of
14 this oath? And to be clear, we're not looking for
15 details of any ongoing investigations, anything like
16 that, just your office's interpretation of this oath.

17 A. Okay. Again, I can only speak to my
18 interpretation of the mandates of the oath, but -- do
19 you want to try to take them one by one or -- you know,
20 I would be tempted to say, you know, just exactly what's
21 written there. I don't -- I think it seems pretty
22 explanatory, but if you have a specific question about
23 any of those elements, I would be happy to weigh in.

24 Q. So you would say that you understand the oath
25 to adhere strictly to the -- to the text as written

5:21-cv-844 (XR)
4/27/2022

Entero v Texas
NATIONAL COURT REPORTERS INC 888.800.9656

Jonathan Sherman White 28

28

1 within the statute?

2 A. I think so, if I understand your question
3 correctly, yes.

4 Q. What kind of assistance is allowed under this
5 oath?

6 MR. HUDSON: Objection, form, foundation.
7 Objection, form, calls for speculation. Objection to
8 the extent that it calls for attorney-client, attorney
9 work-product, or investigative privilege. To the extent
10 you encroach upon any privilege, I instruct you not to
11 answer; otherwise, you're free to do so.

12 A. I would say, according to the text of the
13 statute, allowable assistance is reading the ballot to
14 the voter, directing the voter to read the ballot,
15 marking the voter's ballot, or directing the voter to
16 mark the ballot, preparing the ballot per the directions
17 of the voter.

18 Q. Is there any kind of assistance that would not
19 be allowed under this oath?

20 MR. HUDSON: Same objection. Same
21 instruction.

22 A. From my reading of the statute -- I mean, it --
23 what would be unlawful assistance would be marking the
24 ballot contrary to a voter's intentions, suggesting to
25 the voter how they should be voting, assisting an

5:21-cv-844 (XR)
4/27/2022

Entero v Texas
NATIONAL COURT REPORTERS INC 888.800.9656

Jonathan Sherman White 30

30

1 **A. That is my understanding.**

2 **Q. What kind of illegal behavior would this**
3 **section of the oath be aimed at preventing?**

4 **MR. HUDSON: Objection, form. Asked and**
5 **answered. Objection to the extent it encroaches on**
6 **attorney-client, attorney work-product or investigative**
7 **privilege, I instruct you not to answer. To the extent**
8 **you can answer without encroaching on those privileges,**
9 **you're free to do so.**

10 **A. I would say what I said before, which is,**
11 **suggesting to the voter any -- in any way how they**
12 **should vote, influencing them in the voting process, or**
13 **marking the ballot contrary to the voter's intentions**
14 **and their independent exercise of the vote.**

15 Q. I'm going to show you what is being marked as
16 Exhibit 3.

17 (Exhibit No. 3 marked.)

18 Q. 3, you can read for yourself, which I will
19 represent to you is the oath of assistants from before
20 Senate Bill 1. Again, I'll give you a moment to review.
21 Just let me know when you're finished.

22 **A. Okay.**

23 **Q. Before Senate Bill 1, how was -- or withdrawn.**
24 **How was this oath, which is the oath**
25 **before Senate Bill 1, how was this oath used?**

Entero v Texas 5:21-cv-844 (XR)
4/27/2022

Entero v Texas
National Court Reporters Inc. 888.800.9656

30 Jonathan Sherman White

Page: 30

5:21-cv-844 (XR)
4/27/2022

Entero v Texas
NATIONAL COURT REPORTERS INC 888.800.9656

Jonathan Sherman White 31

31

1 MR. HUDSON: Objection, form, vague.

2 Objection. To the extent it encroaches on attorney

3 client or attorney work-product, investigative

4 privilege, I instruct you not to answer. Otherwise,

5 you're free to answer.

6 A. This oath would have been administered in the

7 same way, at the polling place to an assistant for

8 providing assistance to a voter.

9 Q. Based on your understanding, is there any

10 activity that was permitted previously that is barred

11 under the new revised oath?

12 MR. HUDSON: Objection, form, foundation.

13 Objection to the extent it encroaches on attorney

14 client, attorney work-product, investigative privilege,

15 or legislative privilege, instruct you not to answer.

16 To the extent you can answer without encroaching on

17 those privileges, you're free to do so.

18 A. Well, I would say that 64.034 never was a

19 criminal statute, it never created an offense, but what

20 it did is it caused the assistant at the polling place

21 to be advised of what activity they can and cannot

22 engage in and require them to, you know, take an oath to

23 that effect. What was added in the, I guess, SB 1

24 version was behavior that, like the existing version,

25 was already, I believe, prohibited by other parts of the

Entero v Texas 5:21-cv-844 (XR)
4/27/2022

Entero v Texas
National Court Reporters Inc. 888.800.9656

31 Jonathan Sherman White

Page: 31

5:21-cv-844 (XR)
4/27/2022

Entero v Texas
NATIONAL COURT REPORTERS INC 888.800.9656

Jonathan Sherman White 32

32

1 Election Code which might have been criminal provisions,
2 and those pieces would be -- would pertain to
3 eligibility of the voter for assistance and whether the
4 voter had been pressured or coerced into receiving
5 assistance, as well as communicating information about
6 the voter's vote to another person. Those are all
7 prohibited under other sections of the Election Code,
8 but they were not included in the previous oath.

9 Q. And so looking at the text of the old oath,
10 starting with "I will confine my assistance to answering
11 the voter's questions, stating propositions on the
12 ballot, naming candidates." Do you believe that
13 answering questions are allowed under the revised text
14 of the oath?

15 MR. HUDSON: Objection to the extent that
16 that would call for attorney-client privilege, attorney
17 work-product, or investigative privileged information.
18 To the extent you can answer without encroaching on
19 those privileges, you're free to do so, otherwise, I
20 would instruct you not to answer.

21 A. I think I can answer that question. Could you
22 repeat it, though, for me?

23 Q. Yeah, of course. So let's see. Do you believe
24 that the revised text of the oath would prevent an
25 assister who was providing otherwise lawful assistance

Entero v Texas 5:21-cv-844 (XR)
4/27/2022

Entero v Texas
National Court Reporters Inc. 888.800.9656

32 Jonathan Sherman White

Page: 32

5:21-cv-844 (XR)
4/27/2022

Entero v Texas
NATIONAL COURT REPORTERS INC 888.800.9656

Jonathan Sherman White 35

35

1 assistance that were, you know, guaranteed under federal
2 or state law were prohibited by another part of the
3 Election Code.

4 Q. Would your office have concerns if it received
5 a report of an assister who was providing otherwise
6 lawful assistance, clarified the translation of ballot
7 language after receiving a question from a limited
8 English proficiency voter who didn't understand the
9 first translation?

10 MR. HUDSON: Objection, form, foundation.
11 Objection, form, incomplete hypothetical.

12 A. I can only speak for myself. And if I
13 understand the question correctly, I would not have a
14 problem with a clarifying question being asked about
15 lawful assistance, or answered, I guess.

16 Q. Do you believe that the revised oath would
17 allow an assister to provide that kind of clarifying
18 information or answer a clarifying question about a
19 translation?

20 MR. HUDSON: Objection, form. Calls for
21 attorney-client privilege, attorney work-product, or
22 investigative privilege. To the extent you can answer
23 that without encroaching on those, feel free to do so.

24 A. I would personally not interpret the law,
25 although I see the section that you're referring to, I

5:21-cv-844 (XR)
4/27/2022

Entero v Texas
NATIONAL COURT REPORTERS INC 888.800.9656

Jonathan Sherman White 36

36

1 see that language, I would -- I would not -- in my
2 practice of enforcing the code, I would not interpret
3 this as prohibiting that type of interaction involving
4 lawful assistance activities.

5 Q. Could you -- or withdrawn.

6 Do you believe that -- but you do believe
7 that that is an interpretation that someone could make
8 reading the oath?

9 A. I guess it's really hard for me to determine
10 how any reasonable or unreasonable person might
11 interpret the language of this oath.

12 Q. But you could see a situation where someone who
13 reads the text, "I'll confine my assistance to reading
14 the ballot to the voter, directing the voter to read the
15 ballot, marking the voter's ballot, or directing the
16 voter to mark the ballot," could understand that
17 providing translation clarifications might fall outside
18 of the confines of permitted activity?

19 MR. HUDSON: Objection, form. Foundation.
20 Incomplete hypothetical, speculation.

21 A. I guess I don't think that that would be the
22 most reasonable interpretation of this provision, but I
23 can see how someone could unreasonably or less
24 reasonably construe that one language in isolation of
25 the rest of the oath and take it very narrowly and come

Entero v Texas 5:21-cv-844 (XR)
4/27/2022

Entero v Texas
National Court Reporters Inc. 888.800.9656

36 Jonathan Sherman White

Page: 36

5:21-cv-844 (XR)
4/27/2022

Entero v Texas
NATIONAL COURT REPORTERS INC 888.800.9656

Jonathan Sherman White 39

39

1 I can't think of a situation that would kind of help me
2 put it into context where a word on the ballot would
3 need to be defined for a voter.

4 Q. But you would only be concerned with that
5 activity insofar as it violated a different section of
6 the oath, which is to say, it indicated how a voter
7 should vote?

8 A. Correct, yes. I can't think of another section
9 that it would potentially violate, that would be the one
10 that would come to mind as a concern.

11 Q. Would your office have concerns if a voter with
12 a memory or cognitive impairment asked an assister who
13 had worked with them in advance to prepare to go vote
14 for a reminder as to what they had discussed previously
15 and the assister faithfully recounted that conversation?

16 MR. HUDSON: Objection, form, foundation.
17 Objection, incomplete hypothetical. Object to the
18 extent it would encroach on attorney-client, attorney
19 work-product, investigative privilege. To the extent
20 you can answer without encroaching on those privileges,
21 you're free to do so.

22 A. That's a tough question. There's another
23 section of the code that prevents in the polling place
24 any communication regarding how a voter should vote, and
25 I have never looked at that specifically in the

5:21-cv-844 (XR)
4/27/2022

Entero v Texas
NATIONAL COURT REPORTERS INC 888.800.9656

Jonathan Sherman White 40

40

1 disability contest -- context. But, you know, but if
2 I -- if I'm voting with my wife and she's in the -- the
3 voting booth next to me, I can't tell her, "Hey,
4 remember that race we talked about before, you know,
5 it's -- you know, the one with the two guys with the
6 same last name, it was this other one that" -- I can't
7 do that, and I know I can't do that, or it's like a
8 Class B misdemeanor or Class A misdemeanor. So I don't
9 know. That's a good question.

10 Q. Do you believe that activity -- excuse me. Do
11 you believe that activity of providing somebody with
12 memory or cognitive impairments with a reminder or
13 prompt of a past conversation would fall outside of the
14 permissible activities in the revised oath?

15 MR. HUDSON: Objection, form, foundation.
16 Objection, incomplete hypothetical. Same objection and
17 instruction as to attorney-client, attorney
18 work-product, investigative privilege. To the extent
19 you can answer without encroaching, you're free to do
20 so. Otherwise, I'm going to instruct you not to answer.

21 A. I mean, it's potentially violative of the
22 language. "I will not suggest by word, sign or gesture
23 how the voter should vote," which has been in the oath
24 and it's been in Section 64.036 of the code, the
25 unlawful assistance provision, for as long as I can

Entero v Texas 5:21-cv-844 (XR)
4/27/2022

Entero v Texas
National Court Reporters Inc. 888.800.9656

40 Jonathan Sherman White

Page: 40

5:21-cv-844 (XR)
4/27/2022

Entero v Texas
NATIONAL COURT REPORTERS INC 888.800.9656

Jonathan Sherman White 41

41

1 remember. And so that's an interesting question. I
2 think it would potentially violate -- you would have to
3 look at it and determine whether it violates a number of
4 sections of the code that have existed for many years.

5 Q. So to be clear, your concerns about that kind
6 of activity would be whether it violates a separate part
7 of this oath or existing parts of the criminal code, in
8 that it is instructing a voter to vote rather than
9 providing the voter with information that they're
10 requesting?

11 A. Correct. I think that's how I would look at it
12 primarily, yes.

13 Q. To determine whether or not that was
14 permissible activity?

15 A. Right. Whether they had suggested how the
16 voter should vote or influenced the vote of the voter
17 during the voting process.

18 Q. Uh-huh. Would your office have concerns if an
19 assister who was providing otherwise lawful assistance
20 answered the voter who had visual impairments request
21 for confirmation that the ballot was marked as intended?

22 MR. HUDSON: Objection, form, foundation.
23 Objection, incomplete hypothetical. Objection to the
24 extent it would encroach on attorney-client, attorney
25 work-product, or investigative privilege. To the extent

Entero v Texas 5:21-cv-844 (XR)
4/27/2022

Entero v Texas
National Court Reporters Inc. 888.800.9656

41 Jonathan Sherman White

Page: 41

5:21-cv-844 (XR)
4/27/2022

Entero v Texas
NATIONAL COURT REPORTERS INC 888.800.9656

Jonathan Sherman White 42

42

1 you can answer without encroaching on those privileges,
2 you're free to do so. Otherwise, I'll instruct you not
3 to answer.

4 **A. I would not have any concerns about that. In**
5 **fact, a portion of the oath is, "I will prepare the**
6 **voter's ballot as the voter directs," so I think**
7 **confirming that to the voter would not be violative of**
8 **the oath or any other portion of the Election Code that**
9 **I'm aware of.**

10 Q. Do you consult with the Secretary of State's
11 Office in determining how to interpret these provisions
12 of the law?

13 **A. Provisions in general, or specifically the**
14 **provision that we've been talking about?**

15 Q. Let's start with provisions in general.

16 **A. If there's an area of the code that the**
17 **situation, you know, warrants it, I might discuss with**
18 **the Secretary of State's Office what their**
19 **interpretation of the code is. Under Section 31.003 of**
20 **the code, the Secretary of State is tasked with the**
21 **interpretation and the uniform application of the code,**
22 **so that is their proper role, and I would, under the**
23 **right circumstances, probably do that.**

24 Q. And what would those circumstances be?

25 **A. Just if -- if there's enough question about how**

5:21-cv-844 (XR)
4/27/2022

Entero v Texas
NATIONAL COURT REPORTERS INC 888.800.9656

Jonathan Sherman White 43

43

1 a section should be interpreted, or if, for example,
2 we -- there's a provision in the code that -- I think
3 it's voting day procedures apply to early voting, if
4 possible. In other words, there are some things about
5 early voting that make it different from election day
6 where that's not possible, and so when there's a
7 conflict, that has to be resolved in an interpretive
8 way, and the Secretary of State would certainly be the
9 go to for that since they're responsible for the
10 administration of elections, or at least the
11 interpretation of how elections should be administered.
12 So we would go to them on something like that.

13 Q. So if you had questions about one of the kinds
14 of hypotheticals I mentioned, an assister answers a
15 voter's question --

16 THE REPORTER: We just lost everyone.

17 MR. DELLHEIM: Should we go off the record
18 for a second?

19 (Brief recess.)

20 MR. HUDSON: This is Eric Hudson on behalf
21 of the Office of Attorney General. During the break,
22 counsel discussed entering a stipulation on the record.
23 The stipulation, as I understand it, I'll allow counsel
24 to speak for themselves, is that my client is instructed
25 to avoid -- for the purposes of avoiding duplicative

Entero v Texas 5:21-cv-844 (XR)
4/27/2022

Entero v Texas
National Court Reporters Inc. 888.800.9656

43 Jonathan Sherman White

Page: 43

5:21-cv-844 (XR)
4/27/2022

Entero v Texas
NATIONAL COURT REPORTERS INC 888.800.9656

Jonathan Sherman White 44

44

1 objections or lengthy objections, we're stipulating on
2 the record that my client is instructed not to provide
3 any answers that would encroach on attorney client,
4 attorney work-product, legislative or investigative
5 privileges, or any other applicable privilege, including
6 deliberative process or any others that would be -- that
7 could conceivably be implicated by the questions.

8 Do you understand that instruction,
9 Jonathan?

10 A. Yes.

11 MR. HUDSON: Okay. And I understand that
12 all counsel are going to stipulate to that?

13 MS. PAIKOWSKY: Yes.

14 MR. HUDSON: Okay.

15 MS. PERALES: If I might -- am I
16 stipulating to your instruction to the witness?

17 MR. HUDSON: Stipulating that the -- I'm
18 not going to have to continue making the objection;
19 basically that we have a running objection.

20 MS. PERALES: Yes. We can stipulate to
21 that, to the extent that it applies, yes.

22 MR. HUDSON: Sure. We also understand,
23 though, by way of the stipulation, if my client has any
24 questions about whether there's any kind of privileged
25 information that he needs guidance on, we can still go

Entero v Texas 5:21-cv-844 (XR)
4/27/2022

Entero v Texas
National Court Reporters Inc. 888.800.9656

44 Jonathan Sherman White

Page: 44

5:21-cv-844 (XR)
4/27/2022

Entero v Texas
NATIONAL COURT REPORTERS INC 888.800.9656

Jonathan Sherman White 53

53

1 **A. Not for me to tell you today.**

2 **Q. Does the way that you charge these cases change**
3 **if the voter was eligible for assistance?**

4 **MR. HUDSON: I'm going remind you of the**
5 **ongoing -- the running objection, specifically to the**
6 **parties concerning attorney work product,**
7 **attorney-client privilege, investigative privilege.**

8 **A. I think -- yeah, I think that that would**
9 **probably involve our internal thought processes about**
10 **how we might charge a case depending on specific**
11 **factors, so I might not be able to answer that.**

12 Q. In the statutes is there -- are there criminal
13 violations that are specific to people providing -- or
14 withdrawn.

15 Is there a way in the statutes to
16 distinguish between unlawful assistance, meaning
17 assistance that is provided to voters who are not
18 entitled to it, and unlawful assistance that is
19 influencing a voter who is entitled to and seeks
20 assistance?

21 **A. It's a violation under a different subsection**
22 **of Chapter 64.036. But I don't know that we get into**
23 **that much detail on the spreadsheet. My recollection**
24 **would be that we typically, or we charged more cases,**
25 **and the lion's share of these would have been unlawful**

5:21-cv-844 (XR)
4/27/2022

Entero v Texas
NATIONAL COURT REPORTERS INC 888.800.9656

Jonathan Sherman White 67

67

1 A. Obviously the same provisions are there. I
2 think the same applicable provisions are there, but, I
3 mean, other than that, the only thing that could
4 potentially be applicable is the provision -- that I'm
5 seeing right now is the provision that you mentioned
6 earlier, which is confining assistance to reading the
7 ballot to the voter, directing the voter to read the
8 ballot, marking the voter's ballot or directing the
9 voter to mark the ballot, although I guess you could
10 say, literally if you take a look at that, then if they
11 marked the voter's ballot, even if the voter didn't
12 direct them to do so, that was allowable by this new
13 oath, so I don't know.

14 Q. So is it fair to say that you think -- in your
15 opinion, both oaths don't have specific provisions that
16 get at this activity?

17 MR. HUDSON: I'll remind you of the
18 running objection that has been stipulated to by the
19 counsel present.

20 A. Yeah. I think both -- both those contain
21 language that potentially certainly could be applicable
22 to the activity, and under a different interpretation
23 perhaps neither one have something that's 100 percent on
24 point. The only thing I would add to that is that we've
25 never prosecuted based on an oath. The oath is

Entero v Texas 5:21-cv-844 (XR)
4/27/2022

Entero v Texas
National Court Reporters Inc. 888.800.9656

67 Jonathan Sherman White

Page: 67

5:21-cv-844 (XR)
4/27/2022

Entero v Texas
NATIONAL COURT REPORTERS INC 888.800.9656

Jonathan Sherman White 68

68

1 informative to the assistant of allowable behavior and
2 prohibited behavior, particularly prohibited behavior,
3 and hopefully also instructive to the voter of what the
4 assistant should and should not be doing.

5 It's the underlying offenses in the
6 Election Code that we would look at.

7 Q. So do you believe that an assister who reads,
8 you know, the text of this oath, "I will confine my
9 assistance to reading the ballot to the voter, directing
10 the voter to read the ballot, marking the voter's
11 ballot, and directing the voter to mark the ballot,"
12 would govern the assister's behavior?

13 MR. HUDSON: Objection, form, foundation.
14 Objection, form, incomplete hypothetical.

15 A. Only in the most practical sense, because a
16 person's understanding is going to govern their
17 behavior. Again, I'm, you know, answering a
18 hypothetical. I think in an objective sense, obviously
19 the law says what it says.

20 Q. Could a voter who reads this assistance -- or,
21 sorry, an assister who reads this oath understand it to
22 sort of strictly govern their permissible behaviors?

23 MR. HUDSON: Objection, form, foundation.
24 Objection, form, speculation. Objection, form,
25 incomplete hypothetical.

5:21-cv-844 (XR)
4/27/2022

Entero v Texas
NATIONAL COURT REPORTERS INC 888.800.9656

Jonathan Sherman White 75

75

1 situations where voters were -- voters may have been
2 approached and pressured into receiving assistance
3 outside of a polling place or even with regards to mail
4 ballots, and we did not have an adequate statute to
5 address that interaction at that time. However, I do
6 believe there was a -- possibly an amendment made to
7 Chapter 64.036 that helped in that area, possibly with
8 SB 5 in the special session of the 85th Legislature that
9 helped in that regard, so these may have been older
10 cases.

11 Q. So was that in 2017?

12 A. Uh-huh. Yes, ma'am.

13 Q. And of all of the cases that you have pointed
14 out to me today, which of these, if any, to your
15 knowledge took place in person at a polling place?

16 A. The case that certainly didn't involve mail
17 ballots, and it was the violation of Chapter 61.008,
18 would have happened at a polling place for sure, and
19 I -- I don't recall specifically any others. I'm not
20 saying there weren't any, but I don't recall
21 specifically any others that happened at a polling place
22 that I can tell just based on these notes and without
23 refreshing my recollection.

24 Q. Sorry. One moment.

25 MS. PERALES: And just so I'm not lost,

Entero v Texas 5:21-cv-844 (XR)
4/27/2022

Entero v Texas
National Court Reporters Inc. 888.800.9656

75 Jonathan Sherman White

Page: 75

5:21-cv-844 (XR)
4/27/2022

Entero v Texas
NATIONAL COURT REPORTERS INC 888.800.9656

Jonathan Sherman White 76

76

1 you're talking about Patricia Barton in Medina County on

2 Page 7?

3 THE WITNESS: That's the one that jumps

4 out to memory, yes, ma'am.

5 Q. (By Ms. Paikowsky) So based on your knowledge

6 today, other than that one case, none of those cases

7 listed in the exhibit took place in person at a polling

8 place?

9 A. I'm not recalling any from my memory, so I
10 would agree to that, to avoid having to look through
11 each one of them again, but that's my recollection.

12 Q. And the Patricia Barton case, that one you
13 noted did not involve assistance?

14 A. I don't believe it did involve assistance, no.

15 Q. And all of the cases that we discussed involved
16 violations of existing statutes that predated SB 1?

17 A. Correct, which are still in place today.

18 Q. They're still in place today. Thank you.

19 Just one minute. Okay. So I'm going to
20 move on to the mail -- the mail ballot identification
21 provisions of Senate Bill 1. So first of all, do you
22 believe that all eligible voters who want to participate
23 in an election should be able to cast a ballot and have
24 their ballot counted?

25 A. Yes.

Entero v Texas 5:21-cv-844 (XR)
4/27/2022

Entero v Texas
National Court Reporters Inc. 888.800.9656

76 Jonathan Sherman White

Page: 76

5:21-cv-844 (XR)
4/27/2022

Entero v Texas
NATIONAL COURT REPORTERS INC 888.800.9656

Jonathan Sherman White 77

77

1 Q. So I'm going to show you a document that we're
2 going to mark as Exhibit -- that we're going to mark as
3 Exhibit -- what are we on? 4?

4 MR. HUDSON: Yes.

5 (Exhibit No. 4 marked.)

6 Q. Can you look at Section A3 or, sorry, A4, and
7 tell me what that -- what that provision means?

8 MR. HUDSON: I'll just remind you of the
9 running objection concerning privileges.

10 A. So this is a -- it says it's a new provision.
11 A person commits an offense if a person knowingly or
12 intentionally makes any effort to prevent a voter from
13 casting a legal ballot in an election in which the voter
14 is eligible to vote.

15 I'm not sure how to interpret that, aside
16 from its statutory language, but I would be happy to
17 answer any specific questions you have about it.

18 Q. Do you believe that this law furthers the
19 interest of election integrity?

20 MR. HUDSON: Same objections, including
21 the running objections.

22 A. I -- I imagine that is the intent.

23 Q. In what way do you think this law would further
24 the interests of election integrity?

25 A. I think it's designed -- it seems designed to

5:21-cv-844 (XR)
4/27/2022

Entero v Texas
NATIONAL COURT REPORTERS INC 888.800.9656

Jonathan Sherman White 84

84

1 information to continue the process. That's not to say
2 that a harvesting crew that's well connected with a good
3 database couldn't obtain some of those numbers, but it
4 would be more difficult and it would be above the
5 sophistication level of a lot of harvesting crews that
6 we've dealt with.

7 Q. Okay. And so we talked about vote harvesting.
8 Are there different types of vote harvesting crimes?

9 A. There are a handful of specific offenses in the
10 Election Code that are invoked kind of in the vote
11 harvesting activity.

12 Q. And is vote harvesting illegal at all stages of
13 the voting process?

14 A. It really kind of depends on how you define
15 vote harvesting.

16 Q. Would you mind clarifying for me the different
17 types of vote harvesting crimes that could be deterred
18 by the -- by SB1's new mail ballot ID requirement?

19 MR. HUDSON: Remind you of the running
20 objections.

21 A. Starting at the beginning with vote harvesting,
22 you have a seeding phase or an application phase that
23 focuses on applications for mail ballots, and fraudulent
24 submission of mail ballots on behalf of a voter could be
25 hampered by the requirement to include a piece of

5:21-cv-844 (XR)
4/27/2022

Entero v Texas
NATIONAL COURT REPORTERS INC 888.800.9656

Jonathan Sherman White 85

85

1 identifying information, or an identifier such as a DL
2 or the last four of the social. That could be an
3 obstacle to a vote harvesting crew that wishes to bypass
4 the voter.

5 And then, as I already stated, it could
6 also be an obstacle to gaining the voter's compliance,
7 because here's a stranger asking for my DL number so
8 that they can complete these documents on my behalf or
9 submit this, you know, carrier envelope on my behalf, so
10 it -- by putting the control of the interaction more in
11 the voter's hands because those are -- those are numbers
12 that the voter has access to that the harvester is less
13 likely to have access to, I think it promotes security
14 in that fashion.

15 Q. So if I, moving forward, refer to the activity
16 you described of collecting as many absentee ballots and
17 collecting and submitting ballots by mail as illegal
18 vote harvesting, will you understand what I'm referring
19 to?

20 A. Sure. And if for some reason that definition
21 needs clarifying, then I'll bring it up at that time.

22 Q. You mentioned that SB1's mail ballot
23 identification requirements would be more effective in
24 preventing some vote harvesting more so than others.
25 Are there instances you can think of where SB1's mail

5:21-cv-844 (XR)
4/27/2022

Entero v Texas
NATIONAL COURT REPORTERS INC 888.800.9656

Jonathan Sherman White 89

89

1 or have the voter fill out their own identification
2 number?

3 **A. That's right. Absolutely.**

4 MS. PAIKOWSKY: If it's okay, can I take a
5 five-minute break?

6 **A. Sure.**

7 MR. HUDSON: No objection.

8 (Lunch recess.)

9 **Q. (By Ms. Paikowsky) Mr. White, I'm going to go**
10 **back to asking questions about SB1's mail ballot**
11 **identification provisions. Without SB1's mail ballot**
12 **identification provisions, would your office have other**
13 **means of detecting vote harvesting?**

14 **MR. HUDSON: Object to the extent that**
15 **that would encroach on investigator privilege, and**
16 **remind you of the stipulation concerning the running**
17 **objection. Just instruct the witness, to the extent**
18 **that that would encroach on methods of investigation or**
19 **practices, I'll instruct you not to answer.**

20 **A. Yeah. Without going into our mental**
21 **impressions and our investigative practices, I guess I**
22 **could say we have prosecuted vote harvesting cases in**
23 **the past.**

24 Q. And this, again, is not seeking specific
25 information about any investigation, but do you have --

Entero v Texas 5:21-cv-844 (XR)
4/27/2022

Entero v Texas
National Court Reporters Inc. 888.800.9656

89 Jonathan Sherman White

Page: 89

5:21-cv-844 (XR)
4/27/2022

Entero v Texas
NATIONAL COURT REPORTERS INC 888.800.9656

Jonathan Sherman White 124

124

1 interpreting the statute?

2 HUDSON: Objection, form, foundation.

3 Calls for speculation. Incomplete hypothetical.

4 **A. Yeah, I don't know if I could -- if I could**
5 **answer how a county might or might not interpret or**
6 **enforce the statute.**

7 Q. Do you think counties might vary in their
8 interpretation of Paragraph G, refusal to accept a
9 watcher?

10 MR. HUDSON: Same objections.

11 **A. I don't know.**

12 Q. You do deal with local prosecutors in your
13 current work; is that correct?

14 **A. Yes, ma'am.**

15 Q. Has it ever been your experience that local
16 prosecutors have varied interpretations of the same
17 language within the Texas Election Code?

18 **A. I have experienced that before.**

19 **Q. Have you ever advised a local prosecutor that**
20 **something the prosecutor thought was unlawful was not**
21 **unlawful in your view?**

22 **A. I don't --**

23 **MR. HUDSON: I would remind you of the**
24 **running objection that the parties have stipulated to.**

25 **Otherwise, you're free to answer.**

Entero v Texas 5:21-cv-844 (XR)
4/27/2022

Entero v Texas
National Court Reporters Inc. 888.800.9656

124 Jonathan Sherman White

Page: 124

5:21-cv-844 (XR)
4/27/2022

Entero v Texas
NATIONAL COURT REPORTERS INC 888.800.9656

Jonathan Sherman White 125

125

1 **A. Yeah. I probably couldn't go into those types**
2 **of communications, but I don't recall specific**
3 **situations.**

4 Q. Do you have an attorney-client relationship
5 with local prosecutors?

6 **A. If they approach me in an advisory capacity,**
7 **depending on the situation, I could, but I don't have**
8 **a -- like a freestanding relationship.**

9 Q. Let me ask the question slightly differently.
10 Have you ever stepped in to prosecute an election
11 offense when the local county prosecutor declined to do
12 so?

13 **A. I don't have a specific recollection of any**
14 **time that we have prosecuted a offense where we have had**
15 **a conversation with a District Attorney who has taken**
16 **that position.**

17 Q. Now, prior to December --

18 **A. Uh-huh.**

19 Q. -- it was true, then, that sometimes your
20 office would secure an indictment of a defendant for
21 election fraud without working in cooperation with the
22 local prosecutor; is that right?

23 **A. Without working directly with that office,**
24 **that's correct, we could do that.**

25 Q. And so I believe you had testified previously

5:21-cv-844 (XR)
4/27/2022

Entero v Texas
NATIONAL COURT REPORTERS INC 888.800.9656

Jonathan Sherman White 129

129

1 MR. HUDSON: Objection, form, foundation.
2 Objection, calls for speculation.

3 **A. I don't know what that -- that action would be.**
4 **Could be anything, I suppose.**

5 Q. Okay. Do you know what action would be to
6 distance the watcher from the activity or procedure?

7 MR. HUDSON: Same objections.

8 **A. I don't. I don't have a list of examples of**
9 **that off the top of my head, no, ma'am.**

10 Q. Do you know what would -- do you know what
11 would constitute a manner that would make observation
12 not reasonably effective?

13 MR. HUDSON: Same objections.

14 **A. No. We would -- we would take a set of facts**
15 **that we were given in a complaint and then we would try**
16 **to apply the law, and I don't typically work in reverse.**

17 Q. Have you developed any standards at this point
18 for deciding what would be an action that would obstruct
19 the view of a watcher?

20 **A. No, ma'am.**

21 **Q. Have you developed any standards that would**
22 **allow you to decide whether a poll official had**
23 **distanced the watcher from the activity?**

24 **MR. HUDSON: I'll just remind you of the**
25 **running objection that we have concerning privileges,**

5:21-cv-844 (XR)
4/27/2022

Entero v Texas
NATIONAL COURT REPORTERS INC 888.800.9656

Jonathan Sherman White 130

130

1 and also note the deliberative process privilege is one
2 of those.

3 THE REPORTER: I'm sorry, I couldn't hear
4 you.

5 MR. HUDSON: Deliberative process
6 privilege is also one of those. Instruct you not to
7 answer to the extent you would be encroaching on any
8 privileges.

9 A. I'll follow that advice.

10 Q. Do you have a distance -- let's just talk about
11 the voting machine. Do you vote here in Travis County?

12 A. No, ma'am.

13 Q. Tell me about the -- tell me about the voting
14 apparatus in the county where you do vote.

15 A. Just a typical hard voting system, prints a
16 paper ballot and you scan it in at the door on your way
17 out.

18 Q. So it's a DRE. You use a touchscreen; is that
19 right?

20 A. You use a -- I can't remember if it's a
21 touchscreen or if it's --

22 Q. It's a wheel?

23 A. I can't remember if it's still a wheel, but
24 you -- it will print the ballot for you after you've
25 entered it electronically. And then you turn it in or

5:21-cv-844 (XR)
4/27/2022

Entero v Texas
NATIONAL COURT REPORTERS INC 888.800.9656

Jonathan Sherman White 131

131

1 scan it at the door on your way out.

2 Q. Okay. So generally you vote on a machine that
3 has a screen and it's sitting on a little table with
4 some long legs on it; is that right?

5 A. Yes, ma'am.

6 Q. Okay. And then you're going to take the piece
7 of paper that it gives you, and you're going to walk
8 over to that receptacle and put your piece of paper in
9 there; is that right?

10 A. Yes, ma'am. Place it in the receptacle.

11 Q. Okay. Sometimes called a tabulator. Okay. So
12 let's take the instance of a voter who is standing at
13 one of those voting machines like the kind that you vote
14 on, Mr. White. How close -- let me ask the question
15 this way. How far could a watcher be placed by the
16 election judge such that it would violate Section
17 4.09(a) in SB 1?

18 MR. HUDSON: Objection. Incomplete
19 hypothetical. Objection, calls for speculation.

20 A. I don't think I could answer that.

21 Q. Is it because you don't know?

22 A. I couldn't --

23 MR. HUDSON: Objection, calls for an
24 incomplete hypothetical. Calls for speculation.

25 A. Yeah. I don't have enough facts to -- to

Entero v Texas 5:21-cv-844 (XR)
4/27/2022

Entero v Texas
National Court Reporters Inc. 888.800.9656

131 Jonathan Sherman White

Page: 131

5:21-cv-844 (XR)
4/27/2022

Entero v Texas
NATIONAL COURT REPORTERS INC 888.800.9656

Jonathan Sherman White 132

132

1 answer that question. And even if I did have enough
2 facts, it would probably involve me going into my
3 thought processes about -- about the offense, and so I
4 don't think I could answer that.

5 Q. Okay. At this point, I would like to say on
6 the record that you should listen to your counsel, and
7 especially if he instructs you not to answer the
8 question. But counsel is limited to making form
9 objections and not speaking objections. And so in order
10 to avoid any appearance of coaching the witness, which I
11 know counsel would never do, his form objections --

12 MR. HUDSON: Well, I'll just go ahead and
13 stop you right there and say you're tossing out coaching
14 on the record. Nobody is coaching by giving form and
15 giving the description of what the objection is, which
16 I've been limiting to one word. We also have a standing
17 objection, our standing or running objection based on
18 privileges. And I would point out that some of your
19 questions are clearly targeted at getting at privileged
20 information, so I'm simply reminding the witness of the
21 stipulation that you made early on so that I wouldn't
22 give long objections based on privilege.

23 If you want me to go ahead and start
24 making all formal objections because you're concerned
25 that I'm giving speaking objections, I'm happy to do

Entero v Texas 5:21-cv-844 (XR)
4/27/2022

Entero v Texas
National Court Reporters Inc. 888.800.9656

132 Jonathan Sherman White

Page: 132

5:21-cv-844 (XR)
4/27/2022

Entero v Texas
NATIONAL COURT REPORTERS INC 888.800.9656

Jonathan Sherman White 133

133

1 that. I'm just trying to make sure that my client isn't
2 reaching out and expanding beyond the privilege
3 stipulation that we've already made.

4 MS. PERALES: You have your running
5 stipulation, and we've agreed to that. I just want to
6 make sure that the form objections are stated as
7 succinctly as the rules hope we do.

8 Q. (By Ms. Perales) So let's go back to the
9 voting machine scenario. Mr. White, you're familiar
10 with your own voting machine that you use in the polling
11 place in your home county. If we have a situation where
12 there's a watcher and a voter, and an election judge,
13 and the election judge has distanced the watcher from
14 that machine and the activity of the voter at that
15 machine, is it your testimony that -- that that is still
16 not enough information upon which you could make a
17 decision whether there is a violation of 4.09 of SB 1?

18 MR. HUDSON: Objection, speculation.
19 Incomplete hypothetical.

20 A. I think that's correct, that I wouldn't have
21 enough information.

22 Q. Could you explain to me how this new language
23 in 4.09(a) makes unlawful behavior that previously would
24 have been lawful?

25 A. I would say the plain text that was added adds

5:21-cv-844 (XR)
4/27/2022

Entero v Texas
NATIONAL COURT REPORTERS INC 888.800.9656

Jonathan Sherman White 184

184

1 Q. Understood. In your experience, does vote
2 harvesting occur in the context of paid campaign workers
3 or otherwise compensated individuals working on behalf
4 of a campaign?

5 **A. Generally, yes.**

6 Q. Have you ever encountered an instance of
7 improper voter assistance carried out by an individual
8 who is not working for a political campaign?

9 **A. If so, it would be quite rare.**

10 **Q. Have you ever encountered that instance?**

11 **A. Example -- an example or examples that come to**
12 **mind would be subject to privilege for an ongoing**
13 **investigation or prosecution, so I wouldn't want to talk**
14 **specifically about them, but --**

15 **MR. HUDSON: I'll make a formal objection**
16 **based on that, to the extent it would encroach on**
17 **attorney-client, work-product, investigative privilege,**
18 **or any other stipulated objection, I would instruct you**
19 **not to answer. But to the extent that you can go ahead**
20 **and respond, please do so.**

21 **A. I think -- I think the answer would be**
22 **possibly, yes, without getting into any detail.**

23 Q. Okay. So let me ask a question that might not
24 encroach on privilege. Have you ever yourself or your
25 office brought charges against an individual for

5:21-cv-844 (XR)
4/27/2022

Entero v Texas
NATIONAL COURT REPORTERS INC 888.800.9656

Jonathan Sherman White 185

185

1 unlawful voter assistance when that individual was not
2 working for a political campaign?

3 **A. And by "unlawful assistance," you mean a**
4 **violation of 64.036.**

5 Q. Or the other measures that we have discussed
6 before, 64.012, 276.013.

7 **A. I'm not sure. I'm not sure on those specific**
8 **statutes. But what I could tell you is that almost all**
9 **of the cases that we see that involve assistance fraud**
10 **involve individuals that we believed were associated**
11 **with campaigns or working directly for a candidate or a**
12 **slate of candidates, or were relatives of candidates or**
13 **the candidates themselves.**

14 Q. Thank you. And so sitting here today, you
15 cannot recall an instance in which your office has
16 brought charges against an individual for violating
17 either 64.036 or 64.012, or 276.013, when that defendant
18 was not working for a candidate or campaign or slate of
19 candidates, correct?

20 **A. Or a relative of the candidate or the candidate**
21 **themselves?**

22 Q. Right.

23 **A. If you include those -- if you can give me one**
24 **moment. I can --**

25 **MR. HUDSON: For purposes of the record, I**

5:21-cv-844 (XR)
4/27/2022

Entero v Texas
NATIONAL COURT REPORTERS INC 888.800.9656

Jonathan Sherman White 186

186

1 would point out that you were referencing -- would you
2 identify that by exhibit number?

3 THE WITNESS: That's Exhibit 6, which is
4 the list of our pending -- includes a list of our
5 pending prosecutions.

6 A. I can think of -- I could think of one --

7 Q. Where you brought charges?

8 A. -- case where charges have been brought. There
9 could be more, but I don't have a recollection of them
10 at this time.

11 Q. Tell me about that one case.

12 A. I can't go into that case due to --

13 Q. If charges have been brought, wouldn't that be
14 a public record?

15 A. There's a pending prosecution.

16 Q. I see. Are there charging documents?

17 A. There are.

18 Q. Have they been filed?

19 A. They have.

20 Q. Where have they been filed?

21 A. In the district court where the case is
22 charged.

23 Q. What is that district court? If it's a public
24 record, I'm entitled to know about it.

25 MR. HUDSON: If I could have just a minute

5:21-cv-844 (XR)
4/27/2022

Entero v Texas
NATIONAL COURT REPORTERS INC 888.800.9656

Jonathan Sherman White 187

187

1 to advise him on what he can and can't talk about. If
2 we can go off the record just a moment.

3 (Brief recess.)

4 MR. HUDSON: Mr. White, so I understand,
5 the case that you're referring to is on Exhibit --

6 THE WITNESS: 6.

7 MR. HUDSON: Exhibit 6. I'm instructing
8 you -- to the extent that there's anything in the public
9 record about the case, I'm instructing you to testify
10 about that. To the extent that there are details that
11 are part of ongoing investigative processes,
12 attorney-client privilege, attorney work product, or any
13 other applicable privileges, I'm instructing you not to
14 answer. But to the extent it's on the public record,
15 I'm instructing you to answer.

16 A. The case --

17 MR. HUDSON: Let her ask her question.

18 A. Go ahead.

19 Q. (By Ms. Perales) I think we were out there,
20 the question was half answered. But I'll go ahead and
21 make a new question for you.

22 MR. HUDSON: Sorry about that.

23 THE WITNESS: Sure.

24 Q. Please describe for me the charges that you
25 mentioned a few minutes ago related to a particular

Entero v Texas 5:21-cv-844 (XR)
4/27/2022

Entero v Texas
National Court Reporters Inc. 888.800.9656

187 Jonathan Sherman White

Page: 187

5:21-cv-844 (XR)
4/27/2022

Entero v Texas
NATIONAL COURT REPORTERS INC 888.800.9656

Jonathan Sherman White 188

188

1 defendant and the scenario that I was describing.

2 A. Okay. The case that came to mind does not
3 actually involve ballot assistance, it involved voter
4 registration, and so it may not be directly applicable
5 to your -- your question, and I think it may not. It --
6 what sparked my memory is that it did involve an offense
7 under 276.013, but it was not under the influencing the
8 voter subsection, so I don't think that it would be
9 responsive, but I have been instructed that, if it were
10 responsive, I would disclose to you --

11 MR. HUDSON: Well, don't tell her what I
12 instructed you.

13 THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. I'm sorry.

14 MR. HUDSON: That's on the record.

15 A. But if something is in the public record, I
16 would make that available to you.

17 Q. Yes. So is there a reference to that on the
18 Exhibit 6 somewhere?

19 A. The case is one of our pending -- one of our
20 pending prosecutions.

21 Q. And since charges have been filed, can you
22 point to me which page that pending prosecution is on in
23 the exhibit?

24 A. It's -- well, it's -- again, it's not
25 responsive to the -- to the subject area that we were

5:21-cv-844 (XR)
4/27/2022

Entero v Texas
NATIONAL COURT REPORTERS INC 888.800.9656

Jonathan Sherman White 204

204

1 Q. Thank you. Do you know who Omar Escobar is
2 from Starr County?

3 **A. I do.**

4 Q. Would you consider him a friend?

5 **A. Consider him a former colleague.**

6 Q. Because he's not the DA anymore, correct?

7 **A. Correct.**

8 **Q. Do you -- do you receive complaints about**
9 **public officials coercing votes from their employees**
10 **unlawfully?**

11 **A. We would receive those.**

12 **MR. HUDSON: I'll just remind you of the**
13 **running stipulation. You can answer generally, but to**
14 **the extent it encroaches on privileges, please bear that**
15 **in mind.**

16 Q. (By Ms. Perales) Have you ever prosecuted a
17 public official for coercing votes from public
18 employees?

19 **A. Not that I can recall.**

20 Q. Are you aware of any public information
21 suggesting that Omar Escobar has coerced public
22 employees unlawfully with respect to their political
23 support or their votes?

24 **A. I'm not aware of any -- I'm not aware of any**
25 **public information to that effect.**

5:21-cv-844 (XR)
4/27/2022

Entero v Texas
NATIONAL COURT REPORTERS INC 888.800.9656

Jonathan Sherman White 228

228

1 Mr. White, my name is Laura Rosenbaum. I
2 am one of the attorneys for the Mi Familia Vota
3 plaintiffs in this case. So nice to meet you. And I
4 know it's late in the afternoon. I won't take too much
5 of your time. And hopefully I won't be repeating
6 questions that have already been asked today. There
7 have been a little bit of issues with the Zoom
8 connection, but I just have a couple of topics that I
9 don't, don't think have been fully addressed. Can you
10 hear me okay?

11 **A. Yes, ma'am.**

12 Q. Okay. Thank you. Have you or has your office
13 been involved in any prosecutions for fraud that relate
14 to drive-through voting?

15 **A. No, ma'am.**

16 Q. Are you aware of any investigations into
17 allegations of fraud that relate to drive-through
18 voting?

19 MR. HUDSON: Object to the extent that it
20 would call for attorney-client, attorney work-product or
21 investigative privilege. If you can answer without
22 encroaching on those, you're free to do so. Otherwise,
23 I'm instructing you not to answer.

24 THE REPORTER: I'm sorry, you'll have to
25 slow down. Work product or investigative privilege?

Entero v Texas 5:21-cv-844 (XR)
4/27/2022

Entero v Texas
National Court Reporters Inc. 888.800.9656

228 Jonathan Sherman White

Page: 228

5:21-cv-844 (XR)
4/27/2022

Entero v Texas
NATIONAL COURT REPORTERS INC 888.800.9656

Jonathan Sherman White 229

229

1 MR. HUDSON: To the extent you can answer
2 without encroaching on any of those privileges, you're
3 free to do so.

4 A. I'm not able to discuss any investigations
5 that -- that are not public.

6 Q. Are you aware of any complaints of voter fraud
7 that relate to drive-through voting?

8 MR. HUDSON: Same objection. Same
9 instruction.

10 A. Same answer to the extent that those would have
11 sparked an investigation.

12 Q. So you don't have access to complaints that
13 you've received, that your office has received that
14 relate to drive-through voting? Because if they were
15 received from the public -- from members of the public,
16 they would not be attorney-client privileged.

17 MR. HUDSON: Objection, argumentative.
18 Objection, same instruction. Same objections with
19 regard to privilege.

20 Q. (By Ms. Rosenbaum) The question is, has your
21 office received any complaints from the public that
22 relate to allegations of fraud that involve
23 drive-through voting?

24 MR. HUDSON: Same objection. Same
25 instructions.

5:21-cv-844 (XR)
4/27/2022

Entero v Texas
 NATIONAL COURT REPORTERS INC 888.800.9656

Jonathan Sherman White 235

235

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I, JONATHAN S. WHITE, have read the
 foregoing deposition and hereby affix my signature that
 same is true and correct, except as noted above.

 JONATHAN S. WHITE

STATE OF TEXAS)

COUNTY OF TRAVIS)

Before me, _____, on this
 the day personally appeared JONATHAN S. WHITE known to
 me to be the person whose name is subscribed to the
 foregoing instrument and acknowledge to me that they
 executed the same for the purposes and consideration
 therein expressed.

Given under my hand and seal of office
 this ____ day of _____, 2022.

 NOTARY PUBLIC IN AND FOR
 THE STATE OF _____

Entero v Texas 5:21-cv-844 (XR)

4/27/2022**Entero v Texas**

National Court Reporters Inc. 888.800.9656

235 Jonathan Sherman White

Page: 235

5:21-cv-844 (XR)
4/27/2022

Entero v Texas
 NATIONAL COURT REPORTERS INC 888.800.9656

Jonathan Sherman White 236

236

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
 SAN ANTONIO DIVISION

LA UNION DEL PUEBLO §
 ENTERO, ET AL., §
 Plaintiffs, § Civil Action No.
 § 5:21-cv-844 (XR)
 VS. § (Consolidated Cases)
 §
 STATE OF TEXAS, ET AL. §
 Defendants. §

ORAL DEPOSITION OF
 JONATHAN SHERMAN WHITE
 APRIL 27, 2022

I, CAROLINE CHAPMAN, Certified Shorthand
 Reporter in and for the State of Texas, hereby certify
 to the following:

That the witness, JONATHAN S. WHITE was duly
 sworn by the officer and that the transcript of the oral
 deposition is a true record of the testimony given by
 the witness;

That the deposition transcript was
 submitted on May ___, 2022 to the witness or to the
 attorney for the witness for examination, signature, and
 return to me within 20 days;

That the amount of time used by each party
 at the deposition is as follows:

Honorable Dana Paikowsky - Three hours and

Entero v Texas 5:21-cv-844 (XR)
4/27/2022

Entero v Texas
 National Court Reporters Inc. 888.800.9656

236 Jonathan Sherman White

Page: 236

5:21-cv-844 (XR)
4/27/2022

Entero v Texas
NATIONAL COURT REPORTERS INC 888.800.9656

Jonathan Sherman White 237

237

1 seventeen minutes.

2 Honorable Nina Perales - Three hours and
3 fifty-six minutes.

4 Honorable Laura E. Rosenbaum - Six
5 minutes.

6 That pursuant to information given to the
7 deposition officer at the time said testimony was taken,
8 the appearance pages include all parties of record.

9 I further certify that I am neither
10 counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the
11 parties or attorneys in the action in which this
12 proceeding was taken, and further that I am not
13 financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of
14 the action.

15 Certified to by me on May 2, 2022.

16
17 CAROLINE CHAPMAN, Texas CSR 467
18 Expiration Date: 03/31/2023
19 Firm Registration No. 223
20 WORLDWIDE COURT REPORTERS
21 3000 Wesleyan, Suite 235
22 Houston, Texas 77027
23 (713) 572-2000
24
25

Entero v Texas 5:21-cv-844 (XR)
4/27/2022

Entero v Texas
National Court Reporters Inc. 888.800.9656

237 Jonathan Sherman White

Page: 237